DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 745 HE 027 751

TITLE	Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina.
INSTITUTION	North Carolina Univ., Chapel Hill. Board of Governors.
PUB DATE	10 Sep 93
NOTE	39p.; Tables contain small print.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*College Instruction; *Employer Employee Relationship; Employment Practices; Excellence in Education; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; *Personnel Policy; Promotion (Occupational); *Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*University of North Carolina

ABSTRACT

This report presents findings from an investigation into procedures and criteria for the awarding of tenure to faculty members, conducted by two University of North Carolina (UNC) committees. The investigation found that, generally, tenure policies and procedures within the UNC are sound. Much time is devoted to evaluation of faculty members holding probationary term contracts. In the case of negative decisions, processes are in place for subsequent appeal at several levels. Quality of teaching is a matter of genuine commitment and concern on all UNC campuses and is the most important single factor in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions overall. Institutions are taking aggressive and impressive steps to foster excellence in teaching, including awards to recognize teaching excellence and special activities to support and strengthen instruction. Greater efforts need to be made in this regard at a number of UNC campuses, especially those with limited resources. Institutions should provide tangible incentives and encouragement for tenured and nontenured faculty and graduate teaching assistants to take advantage of professional development opportunities. Six recommendations are offered. An appendix contains five tables on methods for informing faculty of teaching evaluation criteria, evaluation methods, awards for outstanding teaching, special centers for excellence in teaching, and support and activities for teaching improvement. (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 374 745

TENURE AND TEACHING IN THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS

SEPTEMBER 1993

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

HE 027 751

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

University of N.C.
Chapel Hill

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF GOVERNORS
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA

Samuel H. Poole, Durham
Chairman

W. Travis Porter
Durham
Vice Chairman

Roderick D. Adams
Durham

G. Irvin Aldridge
Manteo

Mark L. Bibbs
Chapel Hill

Lois G. Britt
Mount Olive

C. Clifford Cameron
Charlotte

Philip G. Carson*
Asheville

John F.A.V. Cecil
Asheville

Bert Collins
Durham

J. Earl Danieley
Elon College

Charles D. Evans
Manteo

John A. Garwood
North Wilksboro

Derrick E. Griffith
Charlotte

Alexander M. Hall
Willmington

James E. Holshouser, Jr.*
Southern Pines

Wallace N. Hyde
Raleigh

Robert L. Jones*
Raleigh

Jack P. Jordan
Mount Gilead

*Member Emeritus

D. Samuel Neill
Hendersonville
Secretary

John R. Jordan, Jr.*
Raleigh

Valeria L. Lee
Winston-Salem

James G. Martin
Charlotte

Helen Rhyne Marvin
Gastonia

Ellen S. Newbold
Rose Hill

Maxine H. O'Kelley
Burlington

D. Wayne Peterson
Westwood, KS

Marshall A. Rauch
Gastonia

H. D. Reaves
Fayetteville

Benjamin S. Ruffin
Winston-Salem

Joseph H. Stallings
Raleigh

Thomas F. Taft
Greenville

H. Patrick Taylor, Jr.
Wadesboro

Priscilla P. Taylor
Greensboro

Joseph E. Thomas
New Bern

Harold H. Webb
Raleigh

Barbara D. Wills-Duncan
Raleigh

Tenure and Teaching
In the University of North Carolina

THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
BOARD OF GOVERNORS

ADOPTED, September 10, 1993

8,000 copies of this public document
were printed at a cost of $6,720.00 or
$.84 per copy

Table of Contents

Executive Summary ii

I. Introduction 1

II. Tenure 1

A. The Concept of Tenure 1

B. Tenure Policies and Procedures 2

C. Criteria for Tenure 3

III. Teaching 5

A. Evaluation of Teaching 5

1. Sharing of the Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching 5

2. Approaches to the Evaluation of Teaching 5

a. Student Evaluation of Teaching 6

b. Peer Evaluation of Teaching 7

c. Self-Evaluation of Teaching 8

B. Special Approaches Taken to Foster Excellence in Teaching 9

1. Awards for Excellence in Teaching 9

2. Faculty Development and Instructional Improvement 10

IV. Recommendations 14

Appendix 17

Executive Summary

Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina

At the November 1992 meeting of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina questions were raised about the procedures and criteria for the awarding of tenure to faculty members. The comments reflected concerns about institutional personnel decisions which had drawn attention to the evaluation, recognition, and reward of teaching, particularly in tenure decisions. The Chairman of the Board referred the questions and concerns to two standing committees, the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs.

This report distills what was learned by the committees and recommends steps to be taken to further encourage good teaching within the University and to see that the quality of teaching continues to be a prime consideration in tenure decisions.

The concept of tenure, simply stated, is that after a specified probationary period, a member of a faculty at a university or college may be awarded a life-time appointment that can be abrogated only for cause or for program change or financial exigency at the institution. The purpose of tenure is to assure faculty members academic freedom and protection against improper abridgments of the freedom of inquiry through teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activities; and to protect the right to publish or otherwise present scholarly work publicly without the threat of political or other sources of confining orthodoxies.

The quality of the University depends ultimately on the quality of its faculty. Historically, tenure has been a common feature of all major universities and colleges in the United States and crucial to the attraction and retention of outstanding faculty members. How that system operates, the policies and procedures followed, and the standards applied will determine, in large measure, the quality of the faculty and of the University.

Tenure policies of the University of North Carolina are written into Section 602 of *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*, which allows each institution to adopt its own set of tenure policies and regulations that are consistent with *The Code*. All institutional tenure policies must be, and have been, approved by the President of the University and the Board of Governors. Faculty personnel procedures also vary from institution to institution according to the size and complexity of the institution, but there are features common to each of the institutions.

By and large, tenure policies and procedures within the University are sound. Ample time is allowed for and much time is devoted to the evaluation of faculty members holding probationary term contracts. Decisions to reappoint such persons or to award them tenure are not made lightly or hastily. At each level, provision is made for careful and serious review of recommendations. Moreover, in the case of negative decisions, processes are in place for subsequent appeal at several levels.

The detailed criteria for tenure and other faculty personnel decisions are delegated to the institutions. Most institutional tenure policies and regulations simply restate the three criteria found in *The Code*: "demonstrated professional competence, . . . potential for future contributions, and institutional needs and resources." However, because of the wide diversity of academic disciplines and practice in those disciplines, especially in the research universities, more detailed criteria,

developed for each department (or school), have been approved by the appropriate dean and are made available to each new faculty member.

The professional competencies to be judged and the standards by which performance is to be assessed should reflect the basic purposes of the institution. The overall mission of the University of North Carolina is focused upon three major interrelated functions: instruction, research, and public service. The relative importance of each of these functions varies at specific institutions depending upon their respective missions. In assigning a general academic mission to each of the UNC institutions, the board has sought to maintain educational quality and institutional diversity. It has not imposed a uniform emphasis upon teaching, research, and service. Thus the specific criteria for determining and assessing these standards of professional performance must vary among institutions according to their missions.

Whatever its classification, each institution should view teaching as a core requirement. The board states in its long-range plan that teaching or instruction is the primary responsibility of each of the UNC institutions. Thus while neither teaching nor service nor research is the sole measure of a faculty member's competence and contribution at any UNC institution, teaching should be the first consideration at all of the UNC institutions.

The central question that led to our review was whether sufficient consideration is given to the quality of teaching when tenure decisions are made. Our review indicates that quality of teaching is a matter of genuine commitment and concern on all UNC campuses and is the most important single factor in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions overall.

It is evident from institutional mission statements, tenure documents, faculty handbooks, and annual institutional assessment reports that the quality and effectiveness of teaching constitute a common and essential criterion in the evaluation of faculty at each institution, with the relative importance of research and public service being dependent upon the institutional mission. Institutional mission statements should give explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching, and tenure policies and the criteria for making faculty personnel decisions should be consistent with the board-approved missions of the institutions.

The criteria and the means by which teaching is judged should be clear and faculty members should be fully apprised of them. It is clear from a January 1993 survey sent to each of the constituent institutions that:

—The effectiveness of teaching and the evaluation of teaching are matters of continuing, sustained attention at each campus.

—Since teaching embraces activities and responsibilities broader than classroom instruction, appropriate evaluation of teaching must assess more than classroom performance, must involve a variety of techniques, and take into account an individual's contributions to instructional effectiveness, to course development, to curriculum design, and to teaching/instructional innovations.

—The appropriate techniques of evaluation include, but are not limited to, student evaluations. Student evaluations are essential for assessing certain aspects of teaching, but must be interpreted carefully and supplemented with other forms of evaluation.

Other than student ratings, the most common way of assessing teaching performance is peer review. Self-evaluation of performance is also useful and fairly common.

The most common, obvious, and significant way for the University to encourage good teaching is to reward it through decisions for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary increases. Annual institutional assessment reports and the more recent responses to our January survey on teaching describe a wide range of special efforts beyond the obvious to recognize and reward good teaching and to improve instructional effectiveness. Institutions are taking aggressive and impressive steps to foster excellence in teaching. The report focuses upon two aspects of these efforts: awards which are made to recognize teaching excellence, and special activities designed to support and strengthen instruction.

The best of these efforts are designed to discover and devise ways to enhance the teaching process; to assist instructional faculty in curriculum and course development, in the improvement of classroom techniques, and in the use of new instructional technologies; to help faculty to gain a better understanding of students and to develop skills to improve interpersonal relationships with students; and to provide training resources for faculty and graduate teaching assistants.

Greater efforts need to be made in this regard at a number of our campuses, especially those with very limited resources available for such initiatives. Despite financial strains, each institution should allocate a portion of its budget for faculty development and target a specific part of that for the development of teachers and teaching. Funds need to be provided to strengthen existing centers for teaching and learning and to establish centers at institutions which do not now have them. The institutions and the Board of Governors must find additional resources for faculty development.

Institutions should provide tangible incentives and encouragement for tenured and non-tenured faculty and graduate teaching assistants to take advantage of these professional development opportunities. It is encouraging to note that in all of these efforts some of our institutions, most notably the research universities, North Carolina State University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, have begun to give more conscious and serious attention to developing and strengthening the teaching skills of graduate teaching assistants.

To underscore the importance of teaching, and to encourage, identify, recognize, reward, and support good teaching within the University, the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs submit jointly to the Board of Governors the following specific recommendations:

1. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, instruct the Chancellors of each constituent institution to do the following:*

    a. *Review institutional mission statements, tenure policies, and the criteria for making faculty personnel decisions and, where necessary, to revise them so as to give explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching in the University;*

    b. *Revise institutional policies and procedures, as necessary, to require (1) that clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty performance at every level (institution, college/school, department) are provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the review is scheduled to be made, and (2) that a record of these discussions be kept in the individual's personnel file;*

c. *Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.*

2. *That the President of the University be asked to report on these reviews to the Board of Governors by July 1, 1994.*

3. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, call upon the chancellors of institutions which do not now have awards for outstanding teaching to establish such awards either campus-wide or at the college/school level.*

4. *That the Board of Governors create annual system-wide teaching awards with monetary stipends which are designated "Board of Governors' Awards for Excellence in Teaching." (The Chairman of the Board of Governors should name an ad hoc committee to work out the details and present recommendations concerning implementation of this proposal.)*

5. *That the Board of Governors seek appropriations for each campus in biennial budget requests to establish or to strengthen centers and activities designed to encourage and support teaching excellence and to improve teaching effectiveness throughout the University.*

6. *That greater efforts be made to develop and strengthen the teaching skills of graduate students, and that the Board of Governors ask the President to prepare, in consultation with the University-wide Graduate Council, a report with specific guidelines and recommendations for the training, monitoring, and evaluation of graduate students who teach courses in UNC institutions.*

Tenure and Teaching in the University of North Carolina

I. INTRODUCTION

At the November 1992 meeting of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina questions were raised about the procedures and criteria for the awarding of tenure to faculty members. The comments reflected concerns about institutional personnel decisions which had drawn attention to the evaluation, recognition, and reward of teaching, particularly in tenure decisions. The Chairman of the Board referred the questions and concerns to two standing committees, the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs. The two committees held five extended joint meetings on these matters, and the full board devoted one session to this topic at its retreat in April 1993.

The committees considered evidence contained in the following reports and surveys: a University-wide survey of baccalaureate graduates in the Class of 1988, annual institutional assessment reports submitted for 1990-91 and 1991-92, a January 1993 survey on recognition and evaluation of teaching and steps taken to foster good teaching at each UNC institution, and a 1993 report (based on a 1990 survey) which was provided during the course of the committees' work to members of the Board of Governors by the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research. A wide variety of documents, including *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*, tenure policies, mission statements, and the long-range plan adopted by the Board of Governors in November 1992, were reviewed.

The committees also heard a presentation by the chairman of the University-wide Faculty Assembly, who shared assembly resolutions regarding awards for teaching excellence and funding of initiatives to improve teaching which were adopted by that body in April 1993.

This report distills what was learned by the committees and recommends steps to be taken to further encourage good teaching within the University and to see that the quality of teaching continues to be a prime consideration in tenure decisions.

II. TENURE

THE CONCEPT OF TENURE

At the first meeting, the committees considered the nature and purpose of the tenure system; the routes to tenure through probationary periods; the relative emphases given to instruction, research, scholarly and creative activities, and service in the evaluation of faculty for reappointment, promotion, and tenure; and the procedure for handling appeals if a decision to deny tenure is challenged.

The concept of tenure, simply stated, is that after a specified probationary period, a member of a faculty at a university or college may be awarded a life-time appointment that can be abrogated only for cause or for program change or financial exigency at the institution. The generally accepted principles on tenure are found in the documents, *Academic Freedom and Tenure* and the *1940 Statement of Principles and Interpretive Comments*, adopted by the American Association of Colleges and the American Association of University Professors.

The purpose of tenure is to assure faculty members academic freedom and protection against improper abridgments of the freedom of inquiry through teaching, scholarship, research, and creative activities; and to protect the right to publish or otherwise present scholarly work publicly without the threat of political or other sources of confining orthodoxies. Tenure is *not*

awarded to administrative officers, except that if an administrator also holds a faculty appointment in a department, he or she may hold tenure as a *faculty member*.

Tenure *can be revoked* for cause on grounds of incompetence, neglect of duty or serious misconduct that precludes further association with the institution. Tenure can also be terminated for reasons of institutional financial exigency or termination of programs.

The quality of the University depends ultimately on the quality of its faculty. Historically, tenure has been a common feature of all major universities and colleges in the United States and crucial to the attraction and retention of outstanding faculty members. How that system operates, the policies and procedures followed, and the standards applied will determine, in large measure, the quality of the faculty and of the University.

TENURE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

Tenure policies of the University of North Carolina are written into Section 602 of *The Code of the Board of Governors of the University of North Carolina*, which allows each institution to adopt its own set of tenure policies and regulations that are consistent with *The Code*. All institutional tenure policies must be, and have been, approved by the President of the University and the Board of Governors.

While the tenure policies at the institutions vary in detail, they all have certain features in common. First, when a beginning faculty member is hired, he or she is hired on a renewable probationary term contract. There is no obligation on the part of the institution to renew the term contract or in time to award permanent tenure. The faculty member must demonstrate by his or her performance tnat reappointment to a subsequent probationary contract or reappointment with permanent tenure is warranted. It is the obligation of the institution to assess each candidate in good faith and to weigh his or her potential contributions against institutional needs. The 1940 *Statement* of the American Association of University Professors provides that an institution should not continue awarding probationary terms indefinitely; rather, it advocates a limit of seven years under term contracts, during which the institution must make the decision as to whether the individual merits reappointment with permanent tenure or should not be reappointed.

By the terms of *The Code* of the University, an institution may choose not to reappoint an untenured faculty member for any reason that it deems satisfactory, except that such nonrenewal of a contract or denial of tenure cannot be based on the impermissible grounds of the candidate's exercise of the first amendment rights guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution, discrimination on the basis of race, sex, religion or national origin, or personal malice.

Faculty personnel procedures vary from institution to institution according to the size and complexity of the institution, but there are features common to each of the institutions. Recommendations for permanent tenure originate at the departmental level, where peer judgment and advice from senior colleagues in the discipline are available to the department chair. Typically, the recommendation is reviewed at the levels of a dean, a vice chancellor, and ultimately the chancellor, with the assistance of faculty advisory bodies. Negative recommendations may stop at the level where such a judgment is made or at a higher level. The chancellor, following consultation with the board of trustees, forwards positive recommendations for permanent tenure to the President of the University, who may, in turn, recommend final approval by the Board of Governors.

There are processes for appeal of a negative decision. As required by *The Code*, appeals are first heard by a standing committee elected by the faculty. The committee presents its findings and recommendations to the chancellor. Further appeals may be made to the institution's board of trustees and ultimately to the Board of Governors.

By and large, tenure policies and procedures within the University are sound. Ample time is allowed for and much time is devoted to the evaluation of faculty members holding probationary term contracts. Decisions to reappoint such persons or to award them tenure are not made lightly or hastily. At each level, provision is made for careful and serious review of recommendations. Moreover, in the case of negative decisions, processes are in place for subsequent appeal at several levels.

CRITERIA FOR TENURE

The detailed criteria for tenure and other faculty personnel decisions are delegated to the institutions. Most institutional tenure policies and regulations simply restate the three criteria found in *The Code*: "demonstrated professional competence, . . . potential for future contributions, and institutional needs and resources." However, because of the wide diversity of academic disciplines and practice in those disciplines, especially in the research universities, more detailed criteria, developed for each department (or school), have been approved by the appropriate dean and are made available to each new faculty member. It should be noted that the NC School of the Arts does not award permanent tenure but offers appointments through a series of term contracts, a practice common to institutions that specialize in the performing arts.

The professional competencies to be judged and the standards by which performance is to be assessed should reflect the basic purposes of the institution. The mission of the University and of each of the constituent institutions is found in Long-Range Planning, 1992-97, which was adopted by the Board of Governors in November. The statement of the overall mission of the University of North Carolina is as follows:

> **The University of North Carolina is a public, multi-campus university dedicated to the service of North Carolina and its people. It encompasses sixteen diverse higher educational institutions and other educational, research, and public service organizations. Each shares in the overall mission of the University. That mission is to discover, create, transmit, and apply knowledge to address the needs of individuals and society. This mission is accomplished through instruction, which communicates the knowledge and values and imparts the skills necessary for individuals to lead responsible, productive, and personally satisfying lives; through research, scholarship, and creative activities, which advance knowledge and enhance the educational process; and through public service, which contributes to the solution of societal problems and enriches the quality of life in the state. In the fulfillment of this mission, the University seeks an efficient use of available resources to ensure the highest quality in its service to the citizens of North Carolina.**

The mission of the University is thus focused upon three major interrelated functions: instruction, research, and public service. The relative importance of each of these functions varies at specific institutions depending upon their respective missions.

In assigning a general academic mission to each of the UNC institutions, the board has sought to maintain educational quality and institutional diversity. It has not imposed a uniform emphasis upon teaching, research, and service. Thus the specific criteria for determining and assessing these standards of professional performance must vary among institutions according to their missions. In a purely undergraduate institution or program, teaching and institutional and

public service will usually be the major considerations, although scholarship and creative activity are also evaluated. But teaching and research are complementary activities. Strong first professional and graduate programs, especially those at the doctoral level, are closely related to strong research programs. At the research and doctoral-granting universities, therefore, original research and publications are appropriate key criteria for assessing the professional performance of most faculty.

Whatever its classification, each institution should view teaching as a core requirement. The board states in its long-range plan that teaching or instruction is the primary responsibility of each of the UNC institutions. Thus while neither teaching nor service nor research is the sole measure of a faculty member's competence and contribution at any UNC institution, teaching should be the first consideration at all of the UNC institutions.

It is important to note that teaching includes activities and responsibilities beyond the classroom setting, *e.g.*, advisement; mentoring; laboratory supervision; clinical rounds by a physician/professor accompanied by medical students and interns; the direction of research projects and papers, dissertations, and theses; and other contacts and relationships outside the classroom.

Particular attention is given to undergraduate teaching in the board's long-range plan. The principles and priorities which the board has followed in mission assignment and academic program development include the following:

> *The University has a primary obligation to provide undergraduate education of high quality.* The majority of students enrolled in the University are undergraduates, and this imposes on all institutions the responsibility to provide for those students an educational experience of high quality. This is a *basic* obligation of every campus....

Moreover, one of the eight strategic directions, or goals, that the board has adopted in fulfillment of the University's mission is the improvement of the quality of undergraduate instruction. One of the specific strategies to attain that goal is a continuing effort to recruit and retain an outstanding faculty. In order to do that, the plan urges that greater emphasis be placed upon teaching and advising in faculty evaluation, recognition, and rewards, and that the results of faculty evaluation be used to improve faculty performance. A number of other strategies stress the urgent need for better compensation and benefits and greater support for faculty development activities. In all of this, the board asserts that the primacy of teaching is a clear and explicit priority of the University, and that good teaching depends on the quality of the faculty.

The central question that led to our review was whether sufficient consideration is given to the quality of teaching when tenure decisions are made. Our review, as well as the 1993 report by the North Carolina Center for Public Policy Research, indicates that quality of teaching is a matter of genuine commitment and concern on all UNC campuses and is the most important single factor in reappointment, tenure, and promotion decisions overall. The tenure system is not flawless, of course, and errors in judgment are sometimes made. In any given year, however, more than a thousand such decisions are made within the University, with no more than a handful of them being contested or appealed.

It is evident from institutional mission statements, tenure documents, faculty handbooks, and annual institutional assessment reports that the quality and effectiveness of teaching constitute a common and essential criterion in the evaluation of faculty at each institution, with the relative importance of research and public service being dependent upon the institutional mission. In some instances, however, institutional mission statements and written criteria for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure do not adequately reflect these priorities and do not indicate clearly that good teaching is the first consideration in faculty personnel decisions. Institutional

mission statements should give explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching, and tenure policies and the criteria for making faculty personnel decisions should be consistent with the board-approved missions of the institutions.

III. TEACHING

EVALUATION OF TEACHING

The criteria and the means by which teaching is judged should be clear and faculty members should be fully apprised of them. In January 1993 a survey was sent to each of the constituent institutions seeking information on the following: (1) How and when are individual faculty members informed about the criteria for and the means of evaluating teaching, and where are the written criteria found? (2) What forms of teaching evaluation are used in each college or school? (3) What special approaches have been taken to foster the improvement of teaching? The responses to the survey questionnaire were on a college or school basis, if the institutions were so organized. If not, the responses were institution-wide.

The committees already had some fairly extensive information relevant to these concerns in the annual institutional assessment reports. That information was extracted and provided to the committees, as were summaries of responses to the January survey.

The Sharing of the Criteria for the Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty members are informed of the criteria in writing and orally in interviews, conferences, and individual and group meetings, usually by a dean, or department chairperson, or both. The criteria are outlined in increasing detail in institutional, college or school, and departmental documents (faculty handbooks, manuals, and policy statements).

This information may be provided before or during the interview for employment, at the time of initial appointment, in orientation sessions and work-planning conferences at the opening of the academic year, in end-of-year conferences in the spring, in periodic departmental meetings and discussions, and at the beginning of the year in which individuals are to be reviewed for reappointment, promotion, or tenure.

To ensure that priorities and standards are clear, and to avoid possible misunderstandings when personnel decisions are made, clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty performance at every level (institution, college/school, department) should be provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment, promotion, or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the review will be made and a record of these discussions needs to be kept in the individual's personnel file.

Approaches to the Evaluation of Teaching

At every institution there are standing committees at the university, college/school, or departmental levels which are responsible for evaluating faculty performance. These standing committees (*e.g.*, departmental personnel committee, faculty evaluation committee, instruction committee, personnel review committee, tenure and promotion committee, etc.) are made up of faculty members at the department level and of faculty and some administrators at higher levels. The committees render their judgments based upon multiple forms of assessment by students and professional colleagues.

The following general conclusions concerning the evaluation of teaching are clear from the responses to our January survey:

—The effectiveness of teaching and the evaluation of teaching are matters of continuing, sustained attention at each campus.

—Since teaching embraces activities and responsibilities broader than classroom instruction, appropriate evaluation of teaching must assess more than classroom performance, must involve a variety of techniques, and take into account an individual's contributions to instructional effectiveness, to course development, to curriculum design, and to teaching/instructional innovations.

—The appropriate techniques of evaluation include, but are not limited to, student evaluations. Student evaluations are essential for assessing certain aspects of teaching, but must be interpreted carefully and supplemented with other forms of evaluation.

Table 2 in the Appendix tabulates information concerning the use of student evaluations, classroom visits, reviews of instructional materials, and self-evaluations.

Student Evaluation of Teaching

Faculty members often hear students evaluate their instructors in informal, random, and unsolicited comments. In every institution and in virtually every department, however, students are asked to assess instruction and instructors through formal, regular, and written evaluations.

The forms which are used may be uniform within an institution, or they may vary by school/college or department. In almost every instance, the evaluations are mandatory. The frequency varies. For example, they may be used in every class each semester, in every class in the fall semester only, in half the classes each semester, or at least one or two courses for each professor each term or in alternating terms.

Regular student evaluations can provide clear evidence of the organization and clarity of course objectives, effectiveness of preparation and presentation, enthusiasm and interest, ability to stimulate and motivate student effort, fairness of grading, the value of assignments and examinations, the value and promptness of feedback on student performance, personal interest and concern for students, and the availability and helpfulness of the instructor outside the classroom.

Adequate interpretation of these evaluations requires an understanding of how the instructor's performance compares to that of colleagues in similar teaching situations. The nature of the course (required or elective, graduate or undergraduate, seminar or lecture), the profile of students enrolled, the method of instruction, the size of the class, even the time of day must be taken into account. Student evaluations are most valuable and revealing when they are analysed over time and for various courses.

The primary purpose of the evaluation is for feedback which will lead to improvement of courses and teaching. The results of student evaluations are shared with the faculty member and the department chairperson. Narrative summaries, including frequency distributions (means and medians) for the department and/or college, are placed in the individual's personnel file or in a central file. With some exceptions, the results are shared also at the appropriate time with review committees, deans, and others when making decisions about reappointment, promotion, or the awarding of tenure.

Evidence of instructional effectiveness is derived also from former students through exit interviews with graduating seniors, surveys of alumni, and letters received from them. *That evidence demonstrates clearly that student satisfaction with teaching is quite high at UNC institutions. A system wide survey of 7,223 of the 10,484 UNC baccalaureate graduates of the Class of 1988 revealed that 94.7% of the graduates were satisfied with the overall quality of the undergraduate instruction they had received at their institutions.* That percentage was matched or exceeded at eight institutions: North Carolina A&T State University (94.7%), Appalachian State University (94.9%), UNC-Wilmington (95.4%), UNC-Charlotte (95.5%), UNC-Greensboro (96.0%), Pembroke State University (96.6%), UNC-Chapel Hill (97.5%), and UNC-Asheville (97.6%).

Peer Evaluation of Teaching

Other than student ratings, the most common way of assessing teaching performance is peer review. Professional colleagues must be relied upon to judge the "scholarly qualities" of an individual faculty member and to relate his or her contributions to the institutional mission. Other faculty members are much more qualified than students to evaluate the content and substance of the course, the organization and conceptualization of knowledge for student consumption, the instructor's command of the subject, whether she or he is up-to-date on scholarship in the field, and the broader contributions of the individual to curriculum development and pedagogy.

In the typical review, the professor's course syllabi are examined by faculty colleagues. Faculty members have frequent opportunities to review syllabi and instructional materials used by their colleagues in various courses. Such reviews may be for curriculum review and revision (every 2, 3, or 5 years), for instructional improvement, for approval of a new course, for development of a team-taught course, for uniformity in multi-section courses, for exploration of teaching techniques and strategies, for evidence to support nominations for teaching awards, for accreditation or reaccreditation, or as a part of the portfolio of materials that an individual faculty member puts together for an annual review or for reappointment, promotion, and tenure decisions.

These reviews may be done by departmental faculty committees, the chairperson, the entire departmental faculty, and/or the dean of the school or college. Through these reviews, an instructor's peers can make judgments about the content, organization, balance, and emphases of the course, how up-to-date the materials are, the level of expectations of student performance, and the instructional techniques and strategies that are used. The evidence and impressions gained from such reviews, even when done primarily for curriculum development or instructional improvement, cannot be disregarded whenever personnel decisions are made.

It should be recognized that reviews of syllabi look at a relatively narrow piece of the total teaching environment, essentially the course content. Evidence of actual teaching effectiveness is better gleaned from direct observation of a colleague's performance. This may be through formal arrangements for the explicit purpose of evaluation, *i.e.*, classroom visits by the department chairperson, one or two faculty colleagues, members of the departmental personnel committee, the dean, an associate vice chancellor, or others. Table 2 in the Appendix reveals that classroom visits for purpose of evaluation usually are voluntary and by invitation, but are sometimes mandatory, especially for new and non-tenured faculty. In some schools and departments, these visits are scheduled on a regular basis of one or two visits annually, particularly in the year that an individual is to be reviewed for a personnel decision. They are also mandatory whenever specific and recurring complaints or problems about an instructor have come to the attention of the department chairperson or dean.

It is important to note, however, that there are numerous other opportunities to observe a colleague's performance, for example, when classroom visits are made for purposes of accreditation or reaccreditation, when courses are team-taught by several instructors, when faculty

members serve as guest lecturers in colleagues' classes, and when individuals make presentations to groups within and beyond their departments (in forums, lecture series, etc.).

Faculty members have other significant sources of information beyond those noted in Table 2 upon which to judge the teaching effectiveness of individual colleagues. Their opinions and judgments are formed through day-to-day interactions and conversations in non-classroom settings and through measures of student achievement, in later advanced courses, in "juried" evaluations of portfolios, recitals, and exhibitions and on professional licensure examinations, through students' success in obtaining admission to graduate and professional schools, and in winning scholarships and fellowships.

From a variety of methods of evaluation, faculty members know who the good teachers are in their department. Colleagues know whether individual faculty members like students and are willing to advise, counsel, and nurture them. They know whether a colleague has a genuine interest and commitment to teaching and to improvement through participation in workshops and conferences on instruction, and they know whether that colleague avails himself or herself of other resources and support available for the improvement of teaching effectiveness.

Self-Evaluation of Teaching

Self-evaluation of performance can be a valuable step in the improvement of instruction. Conscientious faculty members subject their teaching strategies and instructional techniques to their own critical evaluation on an almost constant basis. Many of them will share their critiques and seek advice from colleagues on how to improve the effectiveness of their courses of instruction. Those faculty who are most interested in doing their best are the ones who tend to take self-evaluation most seriously.

The results of self-evaluation are frequently discussed with department chairpersons at the time of the annual reviews. The use of them in the formal deliberations concerning reappointments, promotions, and tenure is usually voluntary, but a few schools and departments make the submission of self-evaluation portfolios a part of the personnel decision-making process. Faculty members are asked periodically to prepare a statement about the courses that they teach—goals and procedures, course outlines, descriptions of teaching materials and assignments, and copies of examinations—and discussions are held about what worked and what did not and what steps might be taken for improvement.

As noted above, the effectiveness of teaching and the evaluation of teaching have received continuing and sustained attention at UNC institutions, with the primary aim being to improve the quality of instruction. That being so, the evaluation procedures ought to provide information that is helpful in improving and facilitating faculty teaching and student learning.

Since the most common feedback comes from student assessment of classroom instruction, institutions should invest even more effort into the evaluation and improvement of the procedures and instruments used. Although some faculty assail their validity, there is a growing body of evidence that shows that student feedback from student ratings, appropriately used, can indeed improve teaching.

For this reason, faculty members must be actively involved in the design of valid instruments and approaches which will provide insight into specific changes that might improve their courses and instruction. Moreover, student ratings should cease to be an option. Even though the forms may vary by school or discipline, sound and sensitive procedures for student assessment of teaching should be mandated on an institution-wide basis.

The board recognizes that student evaluations must be supplemented by other evidence of teaching effectiveness. The faculty should be primarily responsible for gathering and weighing that evidence. The process by which they do so should be systematic. As in the use of student evaluations, the expectations should be clear, the criteria should be defined, and the data gathering procedures should be carefully developed. Appropriate and timely feedback from these evaluations should be provided to those persons being reviewed. In the case of non-tenured faculty, the results should be discussed in regular pre-tenure reviews. Regardless of the source, whether student assessment, peer review, or self-evaluation, the most useful form of feedback is likely to be a personal portfolio that contains detailed documentation about the teacher's performance as well as personal commentary from the instructor about that performance and any steps to be taken for change or improvement.

SPECIAL APPROACHES TAKEN TO FOSTER EXCELLENCE IN TEACHING

The most common, obvious, and significant way for the University to encourage good teaching is to reward it through decisions for reappointment, promotion, tenure, and salary increases. Annual institutional assessment reports and the more recent responses to our January survey on teaching describe a wide range of special efforts beyond the obvious to recognize and reward good teaching and to improve instructional effectiveness. Institutions are taking aggressive and impressive steps to foster excellence in teaching. The following discussion focuses upon two aspects of these efforts: awards which are made to recognize teaching excellence, and special activities designed to support and strengthen instruction.

Awards for Excellence in Teaching

Table 3 in the Appendix indicates that there are institutional or campus-wide awards for outstanding teaching at 11 of our institutions (ECU, FSU, NCSU, PSU, UNC-Asheville, UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Charlotte, UNC-Greensboro, UNC-Wilmington, WCU, and WSSU). A program of teaching awards is being developed at Elizabeth City State University. There were institutional awards at Appalachian State University in past years, but they are now made at the college or school level. North Carolina A&T State University makes awards at the school level. North Carolina Central University also has had such awards in the past, but did not make any in 1991-92. Formal teaching awards also will be given in 36 colleges and schools in ten of the constituent institutions this year. In four other schools, an awards program is being considered, or developed, with funds being sought to recognize excellence in teaching.

Recipients of the awards are chosen typically through a competitive process of nominations from departments, faculty, students, and alumni. The choice usually is made by a committee of faculty and students. In some instances, the nominations, selections, and awards are made exclusively by students. Awards are made at commencement or another formal occasion, such as a banquet or reception. Recipients receive a framed citation or a plaque and a stipend ranging from $500 to $5,000 for a period of one to three years.

Nomination for such an award is an honor, of course, and at some institutions all of the nominees may receive a tangible reward. For example, in the College of Arts and Sciences at Appalachian State University, all nominees are recognized at a public ceremony, at which time the most outstanding ones are selected for membership in the Academy of Outstanding Teachers. Their names are inscribed on a special plaque. One of the nominees is designated as Teacher of the Year and receives a stipend of $1,000. That recipient in turn presents the award and speaks on the importance of teaching at the ceremony the following year. The NationsBank Award for Teaching Excellence at UNC-Charlotte includes a $2,000 stipend to the winner. Each of the finalists gets a framed citation and a $250 credit toward the purchase of books for the library collection. At North Carolina State University, recipients of campus-wide Outstanding Teaching Awards receive $1,000 each and become members of an Academy of Outstanding Teachers. As members of the

Academy, they become eligible for nomination for an Alumni Distinguished Professorship, six of which are for undergraduate teaching and two of which are for graduate teaching and carry stipends of $3,000 annually for two years.

The most numerous and most generous citations for teaching excellence are at the University of North Carolina in Chapel Hill. These include a large number of campus-wide awards, as well as a variety of awards within the College of Arts and Sciences and the professional schools. There are also departmental citations in several departments throughout the institution.

It is not surprising that there are more monetary awards at the larger institutions with the greater resources. But it is encouraging to note the impressive efforts being made even at the smaller institutions to recognize and reward good teaching, and to learn that systematic and concentrated efforts are being made at institutional and school levels to increase the funds available for teaching awards.

Some institutions are providing special long-term recognition of outstanding teachers. For example, the University of North Carolina at Charlotte has just established the Bonnie E. Cone Distinguished Professorships for Teaching, and the University of North Carolina at Asheville has received recently a challenge grant from the National Endowment for the Humanities to endow a Distinguished Teaching Professorship. UNCA is one of only seven schools in the nation awarded an NEH challenge grant in recognition and support of its outstanding undergraduate teaching in the humanities.

Funds are not normally available to provide monetary awards or prizes for teaching at the departmental level. Some individual departments at Appalachian State University, North Carolina State University, and UNC-Chapel Hill, and perhaps elsewhere, do make such awards, but they are the exception. The suggestion that each department establish such awards is not realistic not only because funds for this purpose are limited or non-existent but also because many academic departments are small, with fewer than 10 faculty members, and a formal program of annual awards is not needed. Individual faculty members within departments are nominees and recipients of institutional or college/school awards for excellence in teaching. Awards at those levels are more meaningful and should be encouraged. Institutions that conduct capital campaigns should include the establishment of teaching awards as one of the purposes for which funds are sought.

The University-wide Faculty Assembly has recommended to the President and the Board of Governors that some system-wide awards for teaching excellence be established. Both public and private funds might be available for this purpose.

Faculty Development and Instructional Improvement

The Board should also provide encouragement and support to recent trends in faculty professional development. The traditional approach to faculty development has been to provide direct assistance to faculty members for research and scholarly activity to enhance competence in their disciplines and to increase publications. In recent years, however, most UNC institutions have begun to emphasize professional development activities which are intended to have a more direct and positive impact on teaching. Greater attention is being paid to systematic and sustained efforts to identify and evaluate teaching skills and to find ways to assist faculty in acquiring further teaching competence. Table 4 in the Appendix identifies those special centers, coordinators, and committees which have been created for that purpose.

The best of these efforts are designed to discover and devise ways to enhance the teaching process; to assist instructional faculty in curriculum and course development, in the improvement of classroom techniques, and in the use of new instructional technologies; to help faculty to gain a better understanding of students and to develop skills to improve interpersonal relationships with

students; and to provide training resources for faculty and graduate teaching assistants. Most significantly, increased opportunities for faculty members to learn from one another have served to open up conversation among them, to further a sense of common purpose, and to renew their interest in teaching. If these new professional development efforts are sustained, they can create a more favorable institutional environment for teaching and learning.

Six institutions (ASU, ECSU, NCSU, UNC-Chapel Hill, UNC-Wilmington, and WCU) have established formal centers for teaching and learning. Although not labeled centers, there are similar efforts elsewhere. For example, institutions have appointed coordinators for faculty development, created teaching effectiveness committees, assembled collections of resource materials on teaching, held annual faculty retreats on teaching and learning, set up curriculum and instructional development programs, and formed task forces on teaching excellence.

Individual colleges and schools and some academic departments have created special committees for instruction or for faculty development and sponsor a wide range of activities to promote and strengthen teaching effectiveness. Table 5 in the Appendix identifies units above the departmental level which provide internal grants for improvement of teaching, for curricular and instructional development, and for general faculty professional development. The same table also indicates which of those units conduct and support seminars, conferences, and workshops on teaching effectiveness. Three examples — North Carolina State University, UNC-Chapel Hill, and Western Carolina University — serve to illustrate the nature and scope of these activities.

At North Carolina State University, the institution conducts a Teaching Effectiveness Workshop which new faculty and graduate teaching assistants each fall are expected to attend and also maintains a Teaching Resource Collection, a guide to books and journals devoted to teaching improvement at the college level, for faculty and teaching assistants. There also is (1) a program of competitive mini-grants for teaching innovations to encourage and support efforts by faculty members to improve instruction and learning in particular undergraduate courses, and (2) an instructional computing grant program to encourage and support faculty in making innovative use of computing in classroom instruction, including the development of instructional computing curriculum materials, software and related tools.

In addition to these university-wide efforts, the College of Agriculture and Life Sciences holds an annual two-day workshop on teaching and learning for faculty and a similar two-day workshop for graduate teaching assistants. The College of Engineering has similar three-day workshops on teaching effectiveness for faculty and two-day workshops for graduate teaching assistants. One of the departments in the College of Education and Psychology periodically offers a course on "Teaching in College" in which its own faculty and faculty from other departments have enrolled. The College of Veterinary Medicine has a competitive awards program for grants to faculty members for instructional development. The college also offers a teaching effectiveness series for all new faculty and interested continuing faculty. Other examples could be cited from the other colleges.

At the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, the highly successful Center for Teaching and Learning in the College of Arts and Sciences provides instructional support to faculty and graduate teaching assistants in the college and in the professional schools. The Center has offered course development grants to faculty since 1990-91. (Other course development grants have been offered for more than a decade.) Workshops are provided annually for faculty who are new teachers and each fall and spring semester for new teaching assistants. In 1988-89, the Center conducted an evaluation of departmental programs for the training of teaching assistants and made recommendations to each department and to the college. Many of these recommendations have been implemented. In 1990, the Center began to offer intensive summer workshops for international teaching assistants to develop their skills in pedagogy and in spoken English and to broaden their understanding of American culture and higher education.

Significant steps also have been taken by the various professional schools at UNC-Chapel Hill to foster the improvement of teaching. The School of Business has a Teaching Task Force currently engaged in a major review of the evaluation of teaching, and the school funds a program of leaves and grants for faculty development. The School of Education has a program for competitive teaching improvement grants and is planning faculty development workshops. Equally impressive efforts are made in the Division of Health Affairs at Chapel Hill. The Health Sciences Library, which serves all of the schools in the division, has a Learning Resources Services Officer. The School of Medicine has long had an Office of Educational Development which sponsors faculty development programs and a Teaching Scholars Program, assists faculty in the development of curriculum, operates a Learning and Assessment Laboratory, and conducts research on many aspects of medical education. A Task Force on Educational Applications of Computing in Medicine has for the past five years encouraged and coordinated the introduction of information technology and computing into medical education. Technical staff develop instructional technology and anatomical specimens and operate "Med-TV," a classroom television system for the entire School. In the School of Nursing, a Design and Educational Support Center established more than a decade ago assists faculty in the areas of curriculum design, learning theory, and instructional techniques. The school also sponsors in-house faculty workshops on teaching and an ongoing Excellence in Teaching Series, which attracts participants from across North Carolina and the Southeast. Other examples could be cited from the other professional schools at UNC-Chapel Hill.

It is clear that both of our major research universities and the individual colleges or schools within them are investing substantial resources in activities designed to improve teaching effectiveness. At the comprehensive universities, however, most of the available means to assist with the improvement of teaching are institution-wide. Individual schools and colleges, and even some departments, may invest some resources in such activities, but the major role of the academic units is to make the campus-wide opportunities known to the faculty and to encourage individuals to take advantage of them.

At some institutions those opportunities are substantial. Western Carolina University has initiated a number of efforts to address teaching effectiveness on its own campus through the Faculty Center for Teaching Effectiveness. Professional development programs include the following:

— a Micro-Grant Program, established in 1981, which promotes quality teaching by providing funds to support travel and other expenses associated with workshop attendance, short courses, mini-internships, and other off-campus activities related to teaching improvement.

— the Vice Chancellor's Instructional Improvement Grants, established in 1975, to provide support for innovative projects aimed at improving the quality and effectiveness of instruction within a course or group of related courses.

— a Faculty Teaching Analysis Program which provides faculty with confidential consultation and analysis of their teaching from the students' viewpoint, videotapes of one or more classes, a self-analysis of their teaching, and specific objectives for altering their teaching approach.

— May Teaching Seminars, begun in 1986, to involve faculty in an intensive week spent examining the literature about effective teaching at the post-secondary level and reflecting on their instructional style.

— the Faculty Fellows Program, begun in 1988, which provides one-quarter to one-half time release for faculty members to serve in the Faculty Center for Teaching Effectiveness. In addition to these programs, the Faculty Center for Teaching Effectiveness provides a variety of opportunities for faculty to meet to discuss teaching, including a summer retreat when funds permit.

The Center also has enabled Western Carolina to assume a statewide leadership role in efforts to improve teaching. It was the founder of the Carolina Colloquy for University Teaching and the Faculty Seminar for Exemplary Teaching conducted at Western Carolina University for faculty and administrators from all or most of the UNC campuses.

In January 1993, the Board of Governors approved the establishment of an Institute for College and University Teaching at Western Carolina University. Building upon the success of the Carolina Colloquy and the Seminar for Exemplary Teaching, the new institute will offer similar programs for faculty from community colleges and private colleges and universities in North Carolina. Faculty development in teaching will be the focus. The institute will offer a variety of seminars, symposia, conferences, and workshops on teaching and learning in higher education.

It is clear from all of these examples and from similar activities and programs elsewhere (listed on Table 5) that UNC campuses are giving serious attention and investing scarce funds to improve instruction. It is also apparent from the listing on Table 5 that greater efforts need to be made in this regard at a number of our campuses, especially those with very limited resources available for such initiatives. Despite financial strains, each institution should allocate a portion of its budget for faculty development and target a specific part of that for the development of teachers and teaching. Funds need to be provided to strengthen existing centers for teaching and learning and to establish centers at institutions which do not now have them. The institutions and the Board of Governors must find additional resources for faculty development.

Institutions should provide tangible incentives and encouragement for tenured and non-tenured faculty and graduate teaching assistants to take advantage of these professional development opportunities. It is encouraging to note that in all of these efforts some of our institutions, most notably the research universities, North Carolina State University and the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, have begun to give more conscious and serious attention to developing and strengthening the teaching skills of graduate teaching assistants. Those two institutions employ the overwhelming majority of teaching assistants within the University, but other applicable institutions must also address this matter.

Our regional accrediting body, the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools' Commission on Colleges, has revised its Criteria for accreditation to include specific requirements regarding the employment, preparation, supervision, and evaluation of graduate teaching assistants. The current Criteria include the following provisions:

> Each institution employing graduate teaching assistants must provide a published set of guidelines for institution-wide graduate assistantship administration, including appointment criteria, remuneration, rights and responsibilities, evaluation and reappointment.
>
> Graduate teaching assistants who have primary responsibility for teaching a course for credit and/or for assigning final grades for such a course...must have earned at least 18 graduate semester hours in their teaching discipline, be under the direct supervision of a faculty member experienced in the teaching discipline, receive regular in-service training and be regularly evaluated....

> The extent of the use of graduate teaching assistants, their professional and scholarly preparation, and the level and quality of their supervision by experienced faculty shall be examined by the Commission on Colleges whenever it evaluates the professional and scholarly preparation of teaching personnel.

The teaching skills and academic preparation of graduate teaching assistants have been a growing concern for some time now, and the recent efforts made to address the concern are impressive. Nevertheless, much more needs to be done in this regard.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Code of the University provides for tenure for faculty members. The concept and purpose of that system are legitimate and valuable. Within the framework of *The Code*, UNC institutions have developed their tenure policies and procedures subject to approval by the Board of Governors. The board's principal concern with respect to the tenure system is whether the policies and procedures as written and applied are consistent with *The Code* and the general mission, priorities, and goals which the board has set for the constituent institutions of the University.

The overall mission of the University, as adopted by the Board of Governors, includes major responsibilities for instruction, research, and public service. The relative importance of each of these functions at an institution depends upon its specific mission, but the long-range plan of the board asserts that instruction is the primary responsibility of each of the UNC institutions.

Institutional mission statements and goals should reflect that priority. In turn, the expectations communicated to individual faculty members, and the criteria for determining how and whether these expectations have been met should be consistent with that priority.

The Board of Governors' expectation is clear: while neither teaching nor research nor service is to be the sole measure of faculty performance at any institution, teaching should be the first consideration at all of the UNC institutions.

Institutional mission statements, tenure policies, and the criteria for assessing faculty performance should be reviewed and, where necessary, revised to ensure that they are consistent with that priority. Institutional policies should require that statements setting forth specific criteria and procedures for faculty advancement and tenure be provided in writing and discussed with faculty members at specific and appropriate times, and that a record of those discussions be kept on file.

A reexamination of the evaluation and reward system within each institution is vital to convey the institution's interest in and commitment to teaching. Evaluation of teaching must be continuing rather than sporadic. Conscious efforts must be made to ensure that there are adequate sources of information about teaching effectiveness and to increase the reliability of the sources.

The committees recommend, therefore, that all UNC institutions include student evaluations and formal methods of peer review in their teaching evaluation procedures, and that student evaluations be conducted at regular intervals, at least once each year, on an ongoing basis. Peer review is expected to include direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and graduate teaching assistants.

The most significant and sustained encouragement of good teaching is to recognize and reward good teachers through reappointment, promotion, awarding of tenure, and salary increases. Beyond that, most of the constituent institutions of the university and many of the colleges and schools within them make annual awards for outstanding teaching. Such awards should be created on all of the UNC campuses, and efforts to secure funds to increase the number of teaching awards should continue. In addition to these institutional or school awards, the Board of Governors is urged to create annual system-wide awards for excellence in teaching.

The board should also provide encouragement and support to the initiation and expansion of faculty professional development activities directed toward the improvement of teaching. It is clear that most of our institutions are already investing substantial resources in such activities. All of them should do so. Moreover, all of them should provide tangible incentives and encouragement for faculty and graduate teaching assistants to participate in these development opportunities. The institutions and the Board of Governors must find additional resources for this purpose.

To underscore the importance of teaching, and to encourage, identify, recognize, reward, and support good teaching within the University, the Committee on Personnel and Tenure and the Committee on Educational Planning, Policies, and Programs submit jointly to the Board of Governors the following specific recommendations:

1. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, instruct the Chancellors of each constituent institution to do the following:*

    a. *Review institutional mission statements, tenure policies, and the criteria for making faculty personnel decisions and, where necessary, to revise them so as to give explicit recognition to the primary importance of teaching in the University;*

    b. *Revise institutional policies and procedures, as necessary, to require (1) that clear and specific statements of criteria for evaluation of faculty performance at every level (institution, college/school, department) are provided in writing and discussed with each probationary faculty member before initial employment and at the beginning of the first term of employment and with each candidate being reviewed for reappointment or tenure at the beginning of the year in which the review is scheduled to be made, and (2) that a record of these discussions be kept in the individual's personnel file;*

    c. *Review procedures for the evaluation of faculty performance to ensure (1) that student evaluations and formal methods of peer review are included in teaching evaluation procedures, (2) that student evaluations are conducted at regular intervals (at least one semester each year) and on an ongoing basis, (3) that peer review of faculty includes direct observation of the classroom teaching of new and non-tenured faculty and of graduate teaching assistants, and (4) that appropriate and timely feedback from evaluations of performance is provided to those persons being reviewed.*

2. *That the President of the University be asked to report on these reviews to the Board of Governors by July 1, 1994.*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. *That the Board of Governors, through the President of the University, call upon the chancellors of institutions which do not now have awards for outstanding teaching to establish such awards either campus-wide or at the college/school level.*

4. *That the Board of Governors create annual system-wide teaching awards with monetary stipends which are designated "Board of Governors' Awards for Excellence in Teaching." (The Chairman of the Board of Governors should name an ad hoc committee to work out the details and present recommendations concerning implementation of this proposal.)*

5. *That the Board of Governors seek appropriations for each campus in biennial budget requests to establish or to strengthen centers and activities designed to encourage and support teaching excellence and to improve teaching effectiveness throughout the University.*

6. *That greater efforts be made to develop and strengthen the teaching skills of graduate students, and that the Board of Governors ask the President to prepare, in consultation with the University-wide Graduate Council, a report with specific guidelines and recommendations for the training, monitoring, and evaluation of graduate students who teach courses in UNC institutions.*

APPENDIX

Table 1

How and When Are Faculty Informed of the Criteria for Evaluating Teaching, and in What Documents are the Criteria Found?*

Institution College or School	When and How Informed of Criteria and Means of Evaluating Teaching?			In What Documents are Criteria Found?		
	Interviews	Initial Appointment	Other Times	University-Wide Policies Handbook/ Manual	College/ School Documents	Departmental Documents
Appalachian State						
Arts & Sciences	x	x	x	x	—	x
Business	x	—	x	x	—	—
Education	—	x	x	—	x	x
Fine & Applied Arts	—	x	—	x	—	x
Music	—	—	x	x	—	—
East Carolina						
Arts & Sciences	x	—	x	x	x	—
Allied Health Sciences	—	x	x	x	x	—
Art	—	x	x	x	x	—
Business	—	—	—	x	x	—
Education	—	x	x	x	x	—
Human Environmental Sciences	—	x(?)	—	x	x	—
Industry & Technology	x	—	x	x	—	—
Medicine	—	—	—	x	—	x
Music	—	x(?)	—	x	x	—
Nursing	x	x	x	x	x	—
Social Work	—	—	—	x	—	—
Elizabeth City State	—	x(?)	x(?)	x	—	—
Fayetteville State						
Arts & Sciences	—	x	—	x	—	—
Business & Economics	—	x	—	x	—	—
Education	—	x	—	x	—	—
North Carolina A&T State						
Arts and Sciences	—	x	—	x	—	—
Agriculture	—	x	—	x	—	—
Business & Economics	—	x	—	x	—	—
Education	—	x	—	x	—	—
Engineering	—	x	—	x	—	—
Nursing	—	x	—	x	—	—
Technology	—	x	—	x	—	—
North Carolina Central						
Arts & Sciences	—	—	x	x	x	x
Business	—	—	x	x	x	x
Education	—	—	x	x	x	x
Law	—	—	x	x	x	x
Library & Information Sciences	—	x	x	x	x	x
NC School of Arts						
Dance	—	x	x	x	x	—
Design & Production	—	x	x	x	x	—
Drama	—	x	x	x	x	—
Music	—	x	x	x	x	—
Div. of General Studies	—	x	x	x	x	—

* A dash (—) indicates no response or no mention.
A question mark indicates that this approach is followed, but when it is done was not clear.

Table 1 (Cont.)

How and When Are Faculty Informed of the Criteria for Evaluating Teaching, and in What Documents are the Criteria Found?*

Institution College or School	When and How Informed of Criteria and Means of Evaluating Teaching?			In What Documents are Criteria Found?		
	Interviews	Initial Appointment	Other Times	University-Wide Policies Handbook/ Manual	College/ School Documents	Departmental Documents
NC State at Raleigh						
Agriculture & Life Sciences	x	x		x		
Design	x	x		x		
Education & Psychology	x	x		x		
Engineering	x	x		x		
Forest Resources	x	x		x		
Humanities & Social Sciences	x	x		x		
Management	x	x		x		
Physical & Mathematical Sciences	x	x		x		
Textiles	x	x		x		
Veterinary Medicine	x	x		x		
Pembroke State	—	x	x	x	—	—
UNC-Asheville	x	x	—	x	—	—
UNC-Chapel Hill						
(Academic Affairs)						
Arts & Sciences	x	x	x	x	x	x
Business	x	x	x	—	x	—
Education	—	x	x	—	x	—
Information & Library Sciences	x	x	x	—	x	—
Journalism	x	x	—	—	x	—
Law	x	x	x	—	x	—
Social Work	—	x	—	—	x	—
(Health Affairs)						
Dentistry	—	—	x	—	x	—
Medicine	—	x	x	—	x	x
Nursing	x	x	x	—	x	—
Pharmacy	x	x	x	—	x	—
Public Health	—	x	x	—	x	—
UNC-Charlotte						
Arts & Sciences	x	x	x	—	x	x
Architecture	—	x	x(?)	x	x	—
Business	x	x	x	—	x	x
Education	—	x	—	x	—	—
Engineering	—	x	—	—	x	—
Nursing	—	x	x	x	x	—
UNC-Greensboro						
Arts & Sciences	—	x	x	x	x	x
Business	—	x	x	x	—	—
Education	—	x	x	x	x	x
Health/Human	—	—	—	x	—	x
Human Environmental Sciences	—	—	—	x	x	—
Music	—	x	x	x	x	—
Nursing	—	x	—	x	x	—

* A dash (—) indicates no response or no mention.
A question mark indicates that this approach is followed, but when it is done was not clear.

Table 1 (Cont.)

How and When Are Faculty Informed of the Criteria for Evaluating Teaching, and in What Documents are the Criteria Found?*

Institution College or School	When and How Informed of Criteria and Means of Evaluating Teaching?			In What Documents are Criteria Found?		
	Interviews	Initial Appointment	Other Times	University-Wide Policies Handbook/ Manual	College/ School Documents	Departmental Documents
UNC-Wilmington						
Arts & Sciences	—	x	—	x	x	—
Business	—	x	—	x	x	—
Education	x	x	—	x	x	—
Nursing	—	x	—	x	x	—
Western Carolina						
Arts & Sciences	x	x	x	x	—	x
Applied Sciences	—	x	—	x	—	x
Business	—	—	x	—	x	—
Education & Psychology	x	—	x	—	x	—
Winston-Salem State	—	x	x	x	—	x

* A dash (—) indicates no response or no mention.
A question mark indicates that this approach is followed, but when it is done was not clear.

Table 2

Methods of Evaluating Teaching

Institution College or School	Student Evaluations			Classroom visits	Review of Instructional Materials	Self Evaluation of Teaching
	Voluntary/ Mandatory	W/Whom Shared	Frequency		Voluntary/ Mandatory	AR-Annual Report
Appalachian State						
Arts & Sciences	M*	fac/chair	every class/ForS	used for TAs	M*	AR
Business	M*	fac/chair	every class/F	—	for curriculum review	AR
Education	M*	fac/chair	every class ForS	*regularly peer	M*	—
Fine & Applied Arts	M*	fac/chair	every class, F	not used	V*	AR
Music	M*	fac/chair	every class ForS	*occasionally dean	M*	—
East Carolina						
Arts & Sciences	M*	fac/chair/others	every class F&S	V	V*	AR
Allied Health Sciences	M*	fac/chair/others	every class F&S	*M/dean	V*	AR
Art	M*	fac/chair/others	every class F&S	*Mdean	M*	AR
Business	M*	fac/chair/others	every class F&S	*V/peer/chair	V*	AR
Education	M*	fac/chair/others	every class F&S	*M for new fac/chair	V*	AR
Human Environmental Sciences	M*	fac/chair/others	every class F&S	*V/peer/chair/dean	M*	AR
Industry & Technology	M*	fac/chair/others	every class F&S	V/chair	V*	AR
Medicine	M*	fac/others	every class F&S	*V/chair/others	V*	AR
Music	M*	fac/others	every class F&S	*M/peer/dean	V*	AR
Nursing	M*	fac/chair	every class F&S	*M 1st yr.-peer/chair	M	AR
Social Work	M*	fac/others	every class F&S	V	—	AR
Elizabeth City State	M*	fac/chair	every class F&S	*M/annually for new fac. chair	M	Voluntary
Fayetteville State						
Arts & Sciences	M*	fac/chair/dean	every class F&S	M*	—	AR
Business & Economics	M*	fac/chair/dean	every class F&S	M*	—	AR
Education	M*	fac/chair/dean	every class F&S	M*	—	AR
North Carolina A&T State						
Arts and Sciences	V*	fac/chair	—	*M for non tenured	varies	voluntary
Agriculture	V	fac	—	Occasionally	M	—
Business & Economics	M*	fac/chair/dean	every class F&S	Infrequent	M	AR
Education	M*	fac/chair	F&S	randomly/chair	M	AR
Engineering	M*	fac/chair	every class F&S	—	—	—
Nursing	M*	fac/asst. dean	F&S	V will become M	M*	AR
Technology	M*	fac/chair	every class F&S	occasionally	M*	AR
North Carolina Central						
Arts & Sciences	M*	fac/chair/others	1 class, F&S	—	—	AR
Business	M*	fac/others	2 class, F&S	*M annually/peers	M*	AR
Education	M*	fac/dean/others	1 Class, F&S	—	M*	—
Law	M*	fac/dean/others	1 Class, F&S	*M for promotion & tenure peers	M*	AR
Library & Information Sciences	M*	fac/dean/others	1 class, F&S	occasionally/dean	M*	AR

*Used in making personnel decisions

Table 2 (Cont.)

Methods of Evaluating Teaching

Institution College or School	Student Evaluations			Classroom visits	Review of Instructional Materials	Self Evaluation of Teaching
	Voluntary/ Mandatory	W/Whom Shared	Frequency		Voluntary/ Mandatory	AR-Annual Report
NC School of Arts						
Dance	M*	fac/dean/others	varies	*M/dean,peers, outside experts	M*	M for reappt
Design & Production	M*	fac/dean/others	varies	*M/dean,peers, outside experts	M*	M for reappt.
Drama	M*	fac/dean/others	varies	*M/dean,peers, outside experts	M*	M for reappt.
Music	M*	fac/dean/others	varies	*M/dean,peers, outside experts	M*	M for reappt.
Div. of General Studies	M*	fac/dean/others	once per year	*M/dean,peers, outside experts	M*	M for reappt..
NC State at Raleigh						
Agriculture & Life Sciences	M* (nontenured)	fac/chair	each class F&S	*routinely by 4 depts /chair	M	V
Design	M*	fac/chair	each class F&S	*sometimes/chair	varies	No
Education & Psychology	M*	fac/chair	each class F&S	as needed, may be used	M	No
Engineering	M*	fac/chair	each class F&S	varies, not routinely	M	V
Forest Resources	M*	fac/chair	each class F&S	varies, not routinely	varies (not used)	no
Humanities & Social Sciences	M*	fac/chair	each class F&S	varies by dept	varies, usually for new & non-tenured fac.	V
Management	M*	fac/chair	each class F&S	none	annually	V
Physical & Mathematical Sciences	M*	fac/chair	each class F&S	occasionally	varies	no
Textiles	M*	fac/chair	ach class F&S	none	not done	V
Veterinary Medicine	M*	fac/chair/others	F&S	occasionally, not routine	M	no
Pembroke State	M*	fac/chair/others	each class F or S	*strongly encouraged most often for new and non tenurefac./chair, peer committees, assoc. V.C.	M*	AR
UNC-Asheville	M*	fac/chair/others	at least 1/2 classes	*about 1/3 of depts use regularly most faculty are in interdisciplinary, team teachingand are evaluated by collegues	M*	AR
UNC-Chapel Hill						
(Academic Affairs)						
Arts & Sciences	varies*	fac/chair/others	varies	*M for reappt., promotion, tenure-by peers	Varies,M for new course, reappt., promotion	V
Business	M*	fac/chair/other	F&S	*M for reappt., promotion, tenure-by peers	*V, M for promotion, tenure	AR
Education	M*	fac/chair/other	each course/F&S	—	sometimes	—
Information & Library Sciences	M*	fac/others	each course/F&S	occasionally	M*	AR
Journalism	M*	fac/dean	each course/F&S	as needed	—	—
Law	M*	fac/dean	each course, F&S	*M for reappt., promotion, tenure-by peers	informal, occasional	V
Social Work	M*	fac/dean/others	eachcourse/F&S	—	M	AR

*Used in making personnel decisions

Table 2 (Cont.)

Methods of Evaluating Teaching

Institution College or School	Student Evaluations			Classroom visits	Review of Instructional Materials	Self Evaluation of Teaching
	Voluntary/ Mandatory	W/Whom Shared	Frequency		Voluntary/ Mandatory	AR-Annual Report
UNC Chapel Hill						
(Health Affairs)						
Dentistry	varies*	fac/chair/others	regularly	in team-taught courses	varies	—
Medicine	M*	fac/chair/others	every course	*varies, sometimes voluntary, sometimes mandatory	V, may be used	V
Nursing	M(maybe)	fac/chair/others	each course	*V	*V	AR
Pharmacy	M*	fac/chair/others	F&S	V	Periodically, not used	V
Public Health	M*	fac/chair/others	F&S	none	V, routine	V
UNC-Charlotte						
Arts & Sciences	M*	fac/chair/others	every class, F&S	V in 6 depts, M in 6, not used in 6	varies, 6 depts do not use, 12 use	—
Architecture	M*	fac/chair/dean	every class, F&S	*periodically-peers, dean, outside professionals	M	—
Business	M*	fac/chair/others	F&S	V	V*	V
Education	M*	fac/chair	every class, F&S	* in one dept	M*,reappt,promotion, tenure	V
Engineering	M*	fac/chair	F&S	*occasionally, as needed	—	—
Nursing	M*	fac/chair/others	each course, F&S	*M,annually,peers	not used to eval.teaching	AR
UNC-Greensboro						
Arts & Sciences	M*	fac/chair	1 to all courses, F&S	*varies used regularly in 3 depts	Varies	AR
Business	M*	fac/chair/others	F&S	none	M*	M in some depts.
Education	V*	fac/chair	F&S	*V but M for promotion & tenure	V*	M* for promotion, tenure
Health/Human Perf.	varies	—	varies	varies	for curriculum review	M* for promotion, tenure
Human Environmental Sciences	M*	fac/chair	F&S	varies	M* for promotion, tenure	—
Music	M*	fac/chair/others	F&S(non-tenured	*M non-tenured	M*	AR
Nursing	M*	fac/chair	F or S each course	none	for curriculum review	AR
UNC-Wilmington						
Arts & Sciences	M*	fac/chair/others	every course F&S	V*	M*	AR
Business	M*	fac/chair	every course F&S	none	M*	No
Education	M*	fac/chair	every course F&S	M*	M*	AR
Nursing	M*	fac/dean/others	every course F&S	M*	M	AR
Western Carolina						
Arts & Sciences	M (except 1 unit)*	fac/chair/dean	F & S	varies by dept, used in 2 depts for decisions	M*	varies
Applied Sciences	M*	—	every course F&S	V	M* in 12 depts	AR
Business	M*	fac/chair/dean	every course F&S	V	M	—
Education & Psychology	M*	fac/chair/dean	F or S	rarely used	M*	AR
Winston-Salem State	M*	fac/chair/others	2 courses, F&S	*M	M*	M

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*Used in making personnel decisions

Table 3

Recognition of Teaching through Formal Awards for Outstanding Teaching by Institution, College, or School within The University of North Carolina, 1992-93

Appalachian State-institution wide	In past years, now by college/school
Arts & Sciences	X
Business	beginning 1994,by student group now
Education	X
Fine & Applied Arts	X
Music	beginning spring 1993
East Carolina-institution wide	X
Arts & Sciences	
Allied Health Sciences	X
Art	X
Business	X
Education	
Human Environmental Sciences	X
Industry & Technology	
Medicine	X
Music	
Nursing	X
Social Work	
Elizabeth City State	being developed
Fayetteville State	X
North Carolina A&T State	
Agriculture	
Arts and Sciences	X
Business & Economics	X
Education	
Engineering	X
Nursing	
Technology	X
North Carolina Central-institution wide	in past years, not in 1992
Arts & Sciences	
Business	
Education	
Law	
Library & Information Sciences	
NC School of Arts	none
Dance	none
Design & Production	none
Drama	none
Music	none
Div. of General Studies	none
NCA at Raleigh-institution wide	X and Teaching Assistant Awards
Agriculture & Life Sciences	special recognition of teaching assistants
Design	considering
Education & Psychology	
Engineering	funds 4 of institutional awards
Forest Resources	
Humanities & Social Sciences	X
Management	developing
Physical & Mathematical Sciences	to graduate assistants
Textiles	X
Veterinary Medicine	X

Table 3 (Cont.)

Recognition of Teaching through Formal Awards for Outstanding Teaching by Institution, College, or School within The University of North Carolina, 1992-93

Pembroke State	X
UNC-Asheville	X
UNC-Chapel Hill	X (and departmental awards by some depts. throughout University)
(Academic Affairs)	
Arts & Sciences	X
Business	
Education	by Graduate Student Assn.
Information & Library Sciences	considering alumni award
Journalism	X
Law	X
Social Work	X
UNC Chapel Hill	
(Health Affairs)	
Dentistry	X
Medicine	X
Nursing	seeking funds to establish
Pharmacy	X by students
Public Health	X (& some depts.)
UNC-Charlotte-institution wide	X
Arts & Sciences	
Architecture	
Business	
Education	
Engineering	X
Nursing	beginning this year
UNC-Greensboro-institution wide	X
Arts & Sciences	
Business	X by students
Education	
Health/Human Performance	
Human Environmental Sciences	X
Music	
Nursing	
UNC-Wilmington-institution wide	X
Arts & Sciences	X
Business	X
Education	
Nursing	X
Western Carolina-institution wide	X
Arts & Sciences	
Applied Sciences	
Business	X
Education & Psychology	X
Winston-Salem State	X

Table 4

Special Institutional Centers, Coordinators and Committees for Excellence and Improvement in Teaching within the University of North Carolina, 1992-93

Appalachian State-institution wide	Hubbard Center for Faculty Development and Instructional Services
Arts & Sciences	
Business	
Education	Faculty Development Committee, Task Force on Classroom Research and Quality Teaching
Fine & Applied Arts	Partners for Effective Teaching Program (1 dept.)
Music	
East Carolina-institution wide	Coordinator for Faculty Development, Teaching Effectiveness Committee of the Faculty Senate
Arts & Sciences	
Allied Health Sciences	Center for Health Sciences Communication
Art	Library of Teaching Resources
Business	
Education	
Human Environmental Sciences	
Industry & Technology	
Medicine	
Music	Clinical Center for Music Education & Music Therapy
Nursing	
Social Work	
Elizabeth City State	Committee on Teaching Excellence, Center for Teaching Excellence
Fayetteville State	
North Carolina A&T State	Considering a Teacher Resource Center
Agriculture	
Arts and Sciences	
Business & Economics	
Education	
Engineering	
Nursing	
Technology	
North Carolina Central-institution wide	Annual Faculty Institute
Arts & Sciences	
Business	
Education	
Law	
Library & Information Sciences	
NC School of Arts	A fund for Faculty Development
NC State-Raleigh-institution wide	Appointment of Dean for Undergraduate Studies, University Teaching Effectiveness and Evaluation Committee, Teaching Resource Collection
Agriculture & Life Sciences	
Design	
Education & Psychology	
Engineering	
Forest Resources	
Humanities & Social Sciences	
Management	Teaching Effectiveness Committee
Physical & Mathematical Sciences	
Textiles	Teaching Effectiveness Committee
Veterinary Medicine	Competitive Instructional Development Program
Pembroke State	Coordinator and Office of Faculty Development, Task Force on Teaching Excellence

Table 4 (Cont.)

Special Institutional Centers, Coordinators and Committees for Excellence and Improvement in Teaching within the University of North Carolina, 1992-93

UNC-Asheville	University Teaching Council, annual Faculty Retreat on Teaching and Learning, Teaching & Learning Center in Library
UNC-Chapel Hill	Center for Teaching and Learning serves most colleges and schools
(Academic Affairs)	
Arts & Sciences	Center for Teaching and Learning, Institute for Arts & Humanities, Committee on Teaching
Business	Teaching Task Force
Education	
Information & Library Sciences	
Journalism	
Law	
Social Work	
UNC Chapel Hill (Health Affairs)	Health Sciences Library
Dentistry	Learning Resources Center, Committee to Evaluate Teaching Effectiveness, Faculty Development Trust
Medicine	Office of Educational Development, Task Force on Educational Applications of Computing in Medicine, Teaching Labs Division
Nursing	Design and Educational Support Center, Carrington Grant Funds
Pharmacy	Faculty Development Committee, Course and Instructor Evaluation Committee
Public Health	Director of Educational Communications, Learning Resource Center (6 years)
UNC-Charlotte-institution wide	Curriculum and Instructional Development Program
Arts & Sciences	
Architecture	
Business	
Education	
Engineering	
Nursing	Director of Nursing Informatics
UNC-Greensboro-institution wide	
Arts & Sciences	Center for Critical Inquiry
Business	
Education	
Health/Human Performance	
Human Environmental Sciences	Faculty Development Committee
Music	Evaluation of Teaching Committee
Nursing	Learning Resource Center
UNC-Wilmington-institution wide	Excellence in Teaching Center
Arts & Sciences	
Business	Teaching Effectiveness Committee
Education	Faculty Development Fund, Cosponsors Excellence in Teaching Center
Nursing	
Western Carolina-institution wide	Faculty Center for Teaching Excellence, Carolina Colloquy, New Faculty Teaching Seminars, Institute for College & University Teaching
Arts & Sciences	
Applied Sciences	
Business	Curriculum & Standards Committee
Education & Psychology	
Winston-Salem State	Faculty Development Committee, external funds and resources for improvement of teaching skills

Table 5

Special Support And Activities For Improvement Of Teaching And Curriculum Within University Of North Carolina, 1992-93

INSTITUTION	Internal grants to improve teaching effectiveness, curricular and instructional development, and faculty development	Conducts and supports seminars, conferences, workshops on teaching effectiveness
Appalachian State-institution wide		
Arts & Sciences	X	
Business		
Education		X
Fine & Applied Arts		
Music		
East Carolina-institution wide	X	X
Arts & Sciences		X
Allied Health Sciences		X
Art		
Business		
Education		X
Human Environmental Sciences		X
Industry & Technology	X	
Medicine		X
Music		X
Nursing		X
Social Work		X
Elizabeth City State		X
Fayetteville State		X
North Carolina A&T State		
Agriculture		
Arts and Sciences		X
Business & Economics		X
Education		X
Engineering		X
Nursing		
Technology		
North Carolina Central-institution wide		X
Arts & Sciences		
Business		X
Education		
Law		X
Library & Information Sciences		
NC School of Arts	X	
NCS at Raleigh-institution wide	X	X
Agriculture & Life Sciences		X
Design		
Education & Psychology		
Engineering		
Forest Resources		
Humanities & Social Sciences		
Management		
Physical & Mathematical Sciences		
Textiles		
Veterinary Medicine	X	X

Table 5 (Cont.)

Special Support And Activities For Improvement Of Teaching And Curriculum Within University Of North Carolina, 1992-93

Pembroke State		X
UNC-Asheville	X	X
UNC-Chapel Hill		
(Academic Affairs)		
Arts & Sciences	X	X
Business	X	
Education	X	X
Information & Library Sciences		
Journalism		X
Law	X	
Social Work		X
UNC Chapel Hill (Health Affairs)		
Dentistry	X	X
Medicine	X	X
Nursing	X	X
Pharmacy		X
Public Health		X
UNC-Charlotte-institution wide	X	
Arts & Sciences		X
Architecture		
Business		X
Education		
Engineering		X
Nursing		
UNC-Greensboro-institution wide	X	
Arts & Sciences		X
Business		X
Education		
Health/Human Performance		
Human Environmental Sciences		
Music		X
Nursing		
UNC-Wilmington-institution wide		X
Arts & Sciences		
Business		
Education	X	X
Nursing		
Western Carolina-institution wide	X	X
Arts & Sciences		3 DEPTS.
Applied Sciences		
Business		X
Education & Psychology		
Winston-Salem State	X	X